CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NO. 2003-059

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA CERTIFYING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL HAS REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SURFERS POINT MANAGED SHORELINE RETREAT PROJECT AND ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO SECTION 15091 OF THE GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

CASE NO. EIR-2352

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of San Buenaventura as follows:

SECTION 1: In accordance with City Council Resolution No. 2002-57, City staff has determined that the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) submitted for Case No. EIR-2352 is accurate, objective, complete, and in compliance with the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines) and Procedures of the State of California and the City of San Buenaventura, and represents the independent judgment of the City.

SECTION 2: The FEIR, having been presented to the City Council, and all procedures having been duly followed as required by law, the City Council hereby certifies that it has reviewed and considered the information contained therein in conjunction with its deliberations regarding Case No. EIR-2352, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines and the Procedures of the State of California and the City of San Buenaventura.

SECTION 3: Based upon the FEIR known as EIR-2352, the mitigation measures contained in the Mitigation Reporting and Monitoring Program incorporated herein as "Exhibit A" will avoid or lessen to an insignificant level, potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project.

SECTION 4: Pursuant to Section 21081 of CEQA and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091, the City Council hereby makes the following findings for each of the potentially significant environmental effects of the proposed Surfers Point Managed Shoreline Retreat Project.

A. Biological Resources

1. Potential Impact – Construction activities would result in the temporary resuspension of nearshore sediments. Nearshore and onshore

construction could increase sediment input to the water column from stormwater runoff, increasing nearshore turbidity. These impacts are expected to be minor and local in nature and result in no impact to the biota or water quality of the area. This is considered a Class III, *less than significant impact.*

Mitigation Measure – The following mitigation measure is recommended:

- **BIO-1** Although no impact to the marine biota or habitats is expected, performing construction activity within the tidal zone during winter, daytime low tides would reduce the resuspension of sediments in the lower intertidal areas.

Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measure, no significant residual impacts relating to biology would occur.

2. Potential Impact – Removal of landscape trees and shrubs may potential impact nesting birds. No sensitive bird species have been identified in the area, which is not considered critical habitat. This is considered a Class III, less than *significant impact.*

Mitigation Measure - The following mitigation measure is recommended:

- **BIO-2** Prior to construction activities and removal of landscape trees and shrubs from the parking lot and the north side of Shoreline Drive, it is recommended that surveys be conducted to determine the presence or absence of nesting birds. In addition, it is recommended that pre-construction surveys be conducted over the entire project impact area to determine the presence or absence of sensitive animal and plant species. If a listed species and/or critical habitat is located in the area of potential impact, early consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will be required.

Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measure, no significant residual impacts relating to biology would occur.

B. Air Quality

1. Potential Impact – During the construction phase of the proposed project, grading activity and movement of cobble material would temporarily increase fugitive dust. Because the Ventura County Air Pollution Control

District has not adopted impact thresholds for temporary construction-related emissions, such impacts are not considered adverse. This is considered a Class III, *less than significant impact*.

Mitigation Measures – The following mitigation measures are recommended:

- **AQ-1** During clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operation, excessive fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled by regular watering, paving construction roads, or other preventative measures using the following procedures:

    - All excavated or graded material shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust. Watering shall occur at least twice daily with complete coverage, preferably in the late morning and after work is done for the day.
    - All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., greater than 30 miles per hour [mph] averaged over a one hour period) so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
    - All material transported off-site shall be either sufficiently watered or securely covered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
    - Facemasks shall be used by all employees involved in grading or excavation operations during dry periods to reduce inhalation of dust, which may contain the fungus that causes San Joaquin Valley Fever.
    - The area disturbed by clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations shall be minimized so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

- **AQ-2** After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation operations, and during construction activities, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:

    - All active portions of the construction site shall be sufficiently watered to prevent excessive amounts of dust.
    - All temporary roads shall be covered with gravel.
    - Soil binders shall be spread immediately after seeding.
    - The area shall be wet down sufficiently at least twice a day, so as to form a crust on the surface with repeated soaking to maintain a crust and prevent wind erosion.
    - Adjacent public thoroughfares and streets shall be swept daily.

- If construction is halted for more than ten consecutive days, a chemical stabilizer shall be applied to graded portions of the site.

- **AQ-3** At all times, fugitive dust emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:

  - On-site vehicle speed shall be limited to 15 mph.
  - All areas with vehicle traffic shall be watered periodically.
  - Streets adjacent to the project site shall be swept as needed to remove silt, which may have accumulated from construction activities so as to prevent excessive amounts of dust.

Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measures, no significant residual impacts relating to air quality would occur.

2. Potential Impact – Construction activity associated with the proposed project would generate a temporary increase in emissions of ozone precursors (nitrogen oxides and reactive organic compounds) due to the use of heavy construction equipment. Because the Ventura County Air Pollution Control District has not adopted impact thresholds for temporary construction-related emissions, such impacts are not considered adverse. This is considered a Class III, *less than significant impact.*

   Mitigation Measure – The following mitigation measure is recommended:

   - **AQ-4** Construction related emissions shall be controlled using the following procedures:

     - Construction equipment shall be maintained and adjusted to minimize emissions.
     - Low-sulfur fuel (0.05 percent by weight) shall be used in construction equipment.
     - Construction truck trips shall be scheduled during non-peak hours to reduce peak hour emissions.
     - Construction activities shall be phased and scheduled to avoid high ozone days.
     - Construction shall be discontinued during second-stage smog alerts or conditions of high winds combined with low humidity.

   Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measure, no significant residual impacts relating to air quality would occur.

C. Parking, Beach Access, and Recreation

1. Potential Impact – During the construction phase of the proposed project there would be a temporary loss of vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian access to the area. This is considered a Class II, *significant but mitigatable* impact.

   Mitigation Measures – The following mitigation measure is recommended:

   - **PAR-1** The project contractor and the City shall develop a Traffic Control Plan to control construction traffic and circulation within the Shoreline Drive corridor during the construction period. An access plan shall also be developed for the area addressing vehicular access, and bicycle access during the Phase I construction period. A construction schedule shall be prepared to avoid where feasible, significant construction during peak activity periods at the Fairgrounds.

   Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measures, no significant residual impacts relating to parking, beach access, and recreation would occur.

2. Potential Impact – During the construction phase of the proposed project there would be a temporary loss of beach parking. This is considered a Class II, *significant but mitigatable* impact.

   Mitigation Measures – The following mitigation measures are recommended:

   - **PAR-2** A Parking Management Plan shall be developed by the Fairgrounds to provide temporary parking for beach users during the period when the beach parking lots are removed/repaired and the replacement parking has not been finished. The Plan shall also identify areas for construction workers and equipment.

   Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measures, no significant residual impacts relating to beach parking would occur.

D. Archaeological Resources

1. Potential Impact – During the construction phase of the proposed project, it is possible that as yet unknown buried archaeological resources could

be disturbed. This is considered a Class II, *significant but mitigatable* impact.

Mitigation Measures – The following mitigation measures are recommended:

- **AR-1** A professional archaeologist shall be retained to monitor ground disturbance if excavation extends below existing fill into native soils. The archaeologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or redirect project construction in the event that potentially significant cultural resources are exposed. A monitoring report shall be prepared upon completion of construction if an archaeologist is needed.

- **AR-2** In the event that archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction, all earth disturbing work within the vicinity of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated, work in the area may resume. A Chumash representative shall be retained to monitor any mitigation work associated with Native American cultural material.

- **AR-3** If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.

Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measures, no significant residual impacts relating to archaeological resources would occur.

E. Aesthetics

1. Potential Impact –During the construction phase of the proposed project landscaping along Shoreline Drive. This is considered a Class III, *less than significant impact.*

Mitigation Measure – The following mitigation measure is recommended:

- **AES-1** For Alternatives 1-3 and 5, landscape trees and shrubs along Shoreline Drive during construction should be replaced with appropriate landscaping as part of the final project design. For the north side of Shoreline Drive, the landscape plan should be similar in

concept to that shown on Figure 4-3. For the south side of Shoreline Drive, landscaping should consist of groundcovers, shrubs, and/or tree species that would not hinder automobile parking along the south side of the street or restrict views from Shoreline Drive or access to the beach or bike path.

Finding – Based on the discussion and incorporation of the above mitigation measure, no significant residual impacts relating to aesthetics would occur.

SECTION 5: Section 21002 of CEQA and CEQA Guidelines Section 15126 (f) requires that an Environmental Impact Report evaluate, and the decision making body consider, a reasonable range of alternatives to a project. Final EIR-2352 has evaluated the following alternatives to the proposed Surfers Point Managed Shoreline Retreat Project that would lessen any significant environmental effects.

A. Alternative 1: Buried Seawall Behind the Retreat Zone. This alternative involves the removal of the existing bike path and parking lot along an approximately 550-meter (1,800-foot) long stretch of the shoreline at Surfers Point in the City of Ventura. The existing Class I bike path would be relocated to the north (away from the ocean) and the parking lot would be replaced with on-street parking along Shoreline Drive.

   This alternative assumes that all improvements seaward of the existing location of Shoreline Drive (existing bike path and parking lot) would be demolished and the area would be re-graded to a smooth slope. No attempt would be made to address episodes of erosion through renourishment of the beach, and erosion episodes would continue at the current frequency. In order to assure the preservation of the improvements landward of the retreat zone during those times of depleted beach sand, this alternative includes a buried seawall seaward of the relocated bike path. All but the uppermost 2 ½ feet of the wall would be buried in place. Construction of the buried seawall would involve temporary excavation of an estimated 26,000 cubic yards of material and placement of about 1,700 linear feet of sheet pile wall and 7,100 tons of stone to create a toe for the wall.

B. Alternative 2: Cobble Mattress with Sacrificial Dune. This alternative would include relocation of the Class I bike pate, removal of the shorefront parking (including removal of landscape trees), and paving of the existing 7.3-acre parking lot that would occur under this alternative would be identical to that described in Alternative 1. In conjunction with removal of the existing bike path and parking lot, approximately five feet of soil below the existing fill lawyer (approximately 19,000 cubic yards of material) would be temporarily

excavated and screened for debris. Clean material would be used as backfill to restore the pre-existing grade, supplemented as necessary with imported cobble and/or sand.

Under this alternative, the beach profile would be stabilized with a cobble mattress. Construction of the cobble matt4ress would first require temporary excavation of about 18,000 cubic yards of material on the foreshore slope to allow cobble to be buried. Then, an estimated 28,000 tons of imported cobble would be placed on the foreshore slope to provide a more erosion resistant beach face and excavated beach quality material would be used as backfill to reconstruct the pre-existing grade. As with Alternative 1, construction of the buried seawall would involve the temporary excavation of material and placement of a sheet pile wall. The cobble mattress and sacrificial sand dune are intended to provide protection to landward improvements during storms but portions of the cobble mattress and dune could potentially erode away during major events. As such, the beach is expected to require periodic renourishment as erosion of the sand and cobble material occurs over time.

C. Alternative 3: Cobble Berm with Retreat Zone. This alternative considered relocation of the Class I bike bath, removal of the shorefront parking lot and replacement with on-street parking (including removal of landscape trees), and paving of the existing 7.3-acre parking lot that would be identical to that described for Alternative 1. Similar to Alternative 2, approximately five feet of subsurface soil below the existing fill layer would be temporarily excavated and screened for debris in conjunction with removal of the existing bike path and parking lot. The shoreline protection that would be implemented under this alternative would be similar to the natural environment at the Emma Wood State Beach shoreline. Boulders and cobble would be imported to construct a natural cobble berm. In contrast to the modest cobble mattress of Alternative 2, the cobble berm of Alternative 3 is intended to serve as the primary means of protection for upland improvements. Approximately 54,000 tons of cobble would be placed on the foreshore slope and beach quality excavated material would be used as backfill to reconstruct the pre-existing grade. The cobble berm is intended to provide protection to landward improvements during storms by portions of the berm could potentially erode away during major events. As such, the berm is expected to require periodic renourishment as erosion of the cobble material occurs over time.

D. Alternative 4: As Needed Extension of Existing Cobble Berm Without Retreat Zone. This alternative involve the extension of the existing cobble berm pilot project that was constructed by the City of Ventura in October 2000, all the way to the Ventura River on an as needed basis. Under this scenario, a cobble berm would be added over time along the 1,800-foot stretch of beach that encompasses the project site. Under this alternative, the shorefront bike

path and parking lot would not be relocated. Rather, both facilities would be repaired and left in the current locations. The cobble berm is intended to provide protection to landward improvements during storms but may erode away during events. As such, the berm is expected to require periodic renourishment as erosion of the cobble material occurs over time.

D. Alternative 5: Preferred Alternative: This alternative is the Preferred Alternative as recommended by the Surfers Point Working Group. The Preferred Alternative is based upon a concept originally presented by the Surfrider Foundation (a member of the Surfers Point Working Group). This alternative would maximize the opportunities for beach restoration while minimizing impacts to the active shoreline and coastal access and recreation. The relocation of the Class I bike path, removal of the shorefront parking lot and replacement with on-street parking (including removal of landscape trees), and paving of the existing 7.3-acre parking lot that would occur under this alternative would be identical to that described for Alternative 1. This alternative is a derivative of the large cobble berm associated with Alternative 3. The difference between the two alternatives is the attention to the existing artificial fill within the retreat zone and the comprehensive restoration of the remnant dunes. This alternative includes to following components:

- Remove non-beach grade fill material within the retreat zone, including any contaminated soils and all debris found below the parking lot and bike path.

- Replace the excavated material with cobble and beach quality sand in order to:
    - Construct a buried cobble berm within the backshore area of the west half of the project area near the river mouth;
    - Re-shape and augment the existing cobble test section within the east half of the project area to establish a more protective cobble berm;
    - Re-establish dunes over the buried cobble berm in the west half, and to a limited extent, over buried portions of the cobble berm in the east half of the project area. Dune restoration and management will include:
        - Re-vegetate with native dune plants
        - Designate walkways for beach access
        - Interpretive signage to educate beach users

F. Alternative 6: No Project: The No Project alternative would maintain the existing shoreline and public improvements in their current condition. There would be no change from the current condition. There would be no change from the current erosion management plan and the current development

would be kept at its present location. No attempt to repair the existing damage to the existing bike path or parking lot would be made. This alternative would not meet any of the stated project objectives.

G. Comparative Evaluation of Alternatives: City Council finds that after review of all of the project alternatives, and the record as a whole, Alternative 5 is the preferred alternative as it would meet a majority of the project objectives while minimizing potential environmental impacts. The basis of this finding is supported by the following:

Alternative 1 has the advantages of providing a sandy beach that may provide areas for recreational beach users and have lower maintenance costs. However, this alternative would lack the ability for beach renourishment through placement of cobble material and would require more frequent maintenance, and associated disturbance of the beach areas. Additionally, this alternative would involve the construction of a buried seawall that may hinder beach access during periods of storm erosion. As such, this alternative would not achieve necessary project objectives and would have the potential to have impacts on beach access and more frequent disturbance of the beach area due to maintenance activities.

While Alternative 2 would include a cobble mattress which would improve the stability of the retreat zone, and a sacrificial dune that would provide a sandy beach area for recreational uses, the cobble mattress would require more frequent renourishment than the more substantial cobble berm associated with Alternatives 3, 4, and 5. Additionally, this alternative would involve the construction of a buried seawall that may hinder beach access during periods of storm erosion. As such, while this alternative would achieve many of the necessary project objectives, it would also have the potential to have impacts on beach access and more frequent disturbance of the beach area due to maintenance activities.

Alternative 3 would involve the relocation of the bike bath, removal of the shorefront parking lot and replacement with on-street parking (including removal of landscape trees), and paving of the existing 7.3-acre parking lot. The shoreline protection that would be implemented under this alternative would be similar to the natural environment at the Emma Wood State Beach shoreline, and is intended to serve as the primary means of protection without construction of a seawall. The cobble berm would provide protection to landward improvements during storms by portions of the berm could potentially erode away during major events. As such, the berm is expected to require periodic renourishment as erosion of the cobble material occurs over time, resulting in more frequent disturbance of beach areas.

Alternative 4 would involve the extension of the existing cobble berm pilot project that was constructed by the City of Ventura in October 2000, all the way to the Ventura River on an as needed basis. Under this alternative, a cobble berm would be added over time along the 1,800-foot stretch of beach that encompasses the project site. The shorefront bike path and parking lot would not be relocated. Rather, both facilities would be repaired and left in the current locations and would be subject to damage from storm events as they are presently. The cobble berm would provide protection to landward improvements during storms but may erode away during events without construction of a seawall. As such, the berm is expected to require periodic renourishment as erosion of the cobble material occurs over time, resulting in more frequent disturbance of beach areas.

Alternative 5 would maximize the opportunities for beach restoration while minimizing impacts to the active shoreline and coastal access and recreation. The relocation of the Class I bike path, removal of the shorefront parking lot and replacement with on-street parking (including removal of landscape trees), and paving of the existing 7.3-acre parking lot that would occur under this alternative would be identical to that described for Alternative 1. This alternative is a derivative of the large cobble berm associated with Alternative 3. The difference between the two alternatives is the attention to the existing artificial fill within the retreat zone and the comprehensive restoration of the remnant dunes. As such, this alternative would meet a majority of the project objectives while minimizing potential environmental impacts.

Alternative 6 would maintain the existing shoreline and public improvements in their current condition. There would be no change from the current erosion management plan and the current development would be kept at its present location. No attempt to repair the existing damage to the existing bike path or parking lot would be made. This alternative would not meet any of the stated project objectives.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 21st day of July, 2003.

Barbara Kam, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM

City Attorney

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF VENTURA) ss
CITY OF SAN BUENAVENTURA)

I, BARBARA J. KAM, City Clerk of the City of San Buenaventura, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly passed and adopted by the City Council of the City of San Buenaventura at a regular meeting thereof held on the 21st day of July, 2003, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Smith, Morehouse, Andrews, Monahan, Brennan and Di Guilio.

NOES: None.

ABSENT: Councilmember Friedman.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have set my hand and affixed the official seal of the City of San Buenaventura this 22nd day of July, 2003.

Barbara J. Kam, City Clerk